

tion of American Independence as the great charter of human liberty and its author as the greatest philosopher and most constructive statesman of any age or time. In convention assembled we pledge ourselves to carry forward in letter and spirit both the Declaration and the political philosophy of its author, and to this end we protest against either of the two old political parties being given power over the American people. Both parties are but the mere hirelings of plutocracy and the instruments by which the fundamental democracy of our country is being assassinated and the masses of our people reduced to a condition of serfdom. Recognizing the impracticability of launching a new political party this year, first, owing to the shortness of time, and, second, to the presence in the canvass of two candidates representing the highest type of personal integrity, intellectuality and progress, Thomas E. Watson, candidate of the People's party, and Eugene V. Debs, candidate of the Social Democratic party, we at present deem it best to confine ourselves to the work of organization on the lines laid down by the Chicago organization, with the addition that said organization will be conducted on the principle: (1) that labor produces all wealth, (2) that all wealth belongs to those who produce it, (3) that every law enacted in support of the institution diverting wealth from its natural owners into the pockets of parasites should be immediately repealed, (4) that the emancipation of wealth producers must come as Jefferson would have it, through increased liberty, not as any of our present political parties wish it, through the enactment of more laws, which must lead to a greater paternalism and a recurrence of the present or worse condition.

The name of the projected party is the Jeffersonian Democracy.

Another third party, the Continental (p. 279) was organized at Chicago on the 31st, with Gen. Charles H. Howard, of Illinois, for President and George H. Shibley, of Washington, D. C., for Vice President. Its platform declares in favor of reciprocity, the government issuance of money, government ownership of railways, the right of labor to organize, an eight-hour day, a direct primary election law, the election of Presidential electors by Congressional districts instead of by States, an income tax, and a ten per cent. tax on vacant ground.

State conventions of the People's party were held on the 31st in Illinois and Indiana. The for-

mer nominated James Hogan for governor of Illinois and the latter Leroy Templeton for governor of Indiana.

An answer to Mayor Harrison's proclamation calling upon opponents of the proposed compromise ordinance extending traction franchises in Chicago to get up a petition against the ordinance or be regarded as approving it (p. 305), was made on the 26th by the Referendum League, as the representative of those voters who last Spring sustained the public policy petition it had submitted against extending traction franchises. The document is dignified and impersonal, and makes the following points of objection to the Mayor's proposition:

1. The question could not be submitted at the approaching Fall election because the full quota of questions will be on the ballot at that time under petitions already nearly complete.
2. A petition for the Fall election could not be used at the Spring election, and would therefore be valueless for that purpose.
3. Petitions procured now would be subject to attack if verbal changes were meantime made in the proposed ordinance.
4. The time allowed would be too short to procure a petition of 100,000 signatures. Furthermore, "it is unreasonable and unfair to demand that those who approve of an existing and constitutionally expressed public policy shall get up a monster petition to sustain it every time some official assumes it ought to be changed or would like to take some action contrary to it. Yet this is the position of the Mayor on the question at issue. The reasonable and fair course would be to refuse any franchise grant unless and until the traction companies or those who favor a franchise file a petition placing the question on the ballot and show that the people are willing to reverse their former position. In other words, the expense of a petition (at least several thousand dollars) and all the labor of circulating it should be borne by the people who want to see the franchise granted, and not by those who are opposed to it and have already been put to this expense and secured the present public policy vote against it." Reference is made also to the Mayor's pledge, when a candidate for reelection, in which he made the following declaration inconsistent with his present policy:

As Mayor of this city, I do not regard the signing of pledges to separate bodies as exactly a dignified proceeding, and for that

reason must decline to affix my name to the pledge you sent me. I can say this, however, that in every speech I am making in the present campaign I am calling attention to the necessity of the referendum on all proposed franchise extension ordinances, and am giving my pledge to the people direct to withhold my approval from any ordinance which does not give to the people a right they expect and demand, viz.: A referendum vote on all franchise extension ordinances passed by the City Council.

In conclusion the League's protest is as follows: "In conclusion we submit that the Mayor's proclamation is in direct conflict with the position of more than a majority of the members of the City Council, who have in writing pledged themselves as follows: 'I hereby pledge myself to be governed in all my official actions by the will of the people, as expressed by the majority of those voting the 'Little Ballot'; therefore, I will oppose the passage of any ordinance for the settlement of the traction question unless the same shall have been submitted to the voters of Chicago and shall have been approved by a majority of those voting thereon.'"

Mayor Harrison has made no formal response to this protest, but through an interview on the 28th, in the Record-Herald, which supports him in his policy of enacting the proposed ordinance without a referendum on it, and may therefore be presumed to have reported him fairly, he said:

At the last election the "little ballot" proposition of immediate municipal control had 121,957 votes for and 50,807 against. At the same time there were four candidates, and, in general, two opposing platforms. Mr. Cruce was the acknowledged champion of the immediate municipal control idea, and the people favored him with less than 10,000 votes. Then there was a gentleman on the Socialist ticket, a dyed-in-the-wool blown-in-the-bottle advocate of immediate municipal control. He got about 10,000 votes. Graeme Stewart was a settlement man, and he received 138,000 votes. I also was running on another settlement platform, and I was given 146,000 votes. In other words, the candidates who favored a settlement of some sort or other received 284,000 votes, while the immediate control candidates received about 20,000 votes. The settlement candidates polled 284,000 votes, while the "little ballot" proposition for immediate municipal control received only 120,000 favorable votes. In selecting me for Mayor; did the voters repudiate my platform? They knew my views, expressed, as they had been, in half a dozen annual messages and in hundreds of campaign speeches. Did they elect me to carry out the promises I had made, the policy I had

said I would follow if made Mayor again? One hundred and forty-eight thousand voters elected me, presumably to carry my platform into effect. Am I to disregard their wishes and do what the 20,000 who voted on the "little ballot" proposition ask? Wouldn't that be rather much of a minority rule?

In the same strain Mayor Harrison continued:

The referendum idea has been placed before the people heretofore as an academic proposition. Now I propose to place a tangible proposition before the voters. I propose to give them a vote on a specific ordinance, and they will get it if those gentlemen with lungs will stop their shouting long enough to rustle around and get busy with petitions. They make two complaints. They say that only three questions can be placed on the next "little ballot," and that these questions are about decided on by petitions now in circulation. They say that if these questions do not go on the ballot faith will be sadly broken, and yet one of these questions is "home rule in taxation." They might as well ask the voters if they like three meals a day. They say they haven't time enough to get the requisite 100,000 signatures. Let 'em get to work and stop hollering. The trouble with 'em is they're too fond of distributing what Stanley Kunz, in immortal words, called "the bunk." I am not peevish. I am not critical nor captious, but simply as a seeker for information let me ask, "who is the Referendum League?" What membership has it? As a searcher after truth I make this request, "Gentlemen, produce. Show to a curious world the roster of your league." I have heard it said that five men constitute the league. Say it has fourteen members. Are they going to run me as they see fit? They produce no arguments. They get on the house-tops, beat the tomtoms, clash the cymbals, and make a deuce of a roar, but that is not argument.

At a meeting on the 27th of the executive committee of the Municipal Ownership convention,—a delegate body composed of representatives of the labor unions, turner societies and other organizations of Chicago,—a resolution was passed denouncing Mayor Harrison's franchise extension policy, and further declaring that—

It is the sense of this body that every individual and every organization in the city should cooperate with this convention not only to secure municipal ownership, but to emphasize the force of the popular will as expressed at the

polls, to the end that a republican form of government shall be preserved.

Judge Tuley, the distinguished chancellor of the Chicago bench, whose judicial fame is of the highest order, has declared himself on the same subject. In a lengthy and carefully thought-out interview in the Chicago Examiner of the 31st he said of the "little ballot" vote of last Spring against franchise extensions, that he had "thought that no Council would ever dare to attempt the passage of a franchise ordinance without a referendum after that vote." He added: "That a Council should contemplate doing that now is astounding." To the proposed ordinance itself Judge Tuley's specific objections were as follows:

1. The ordinance destroys hope of municipal ownership.
2. In the plan of commuting the unexpired franchises it gives the company more than it is entitled to.
3. It is indefinite as to what the city would have a contract right to take over at the end of the thirteen years.
4. It is misleading in its attempt to waive the rights of stockholders under the 99-year act, which cannot be done.
5. It would leave the city in an interminable tangle to the advantage of the traction company at the end of the thirteen years, with the inevitable result of another twenty years' extension of the franchises.
6. It gives the traction company unquestioned right of way in the streets over every other form of transportation and traffic.
7. It gives the company a valuable concession in the right to sublet the use of its trolley poles.
8. It gives the company the right to a five-cent fare for twenty years without power to regulate fares on the part of the city.
9. It gives the company the right to a "package and parcel" freight business in addition to the passenger business.
10. It practically suggests a parcel room in cars that the company might also collect for some parcels the people now carry free. This is possible, notwithstanding the provision allowing ordinary handbags and parcels in the hands of passengers free.
11. It sets a fictitious and outrageous value on stub ends of franchises to the disadvantage of the public.
12. It practically puts the appraisal of the property, in case the city undertakes to buy, in the hands of Federal judges to the exclusion of State judges.

13. It does not provide for lower fares or a means of ever lowering them.

14. It turns the compensation into the city treasury to be used to the advantage of the general taxpayer, instead of the users of the street cars.

15. It does not create a sinking fund to enable the city to buy the lines at the end of the franchise period.

16. It would leave the city worse off at the end of the franchise period than now, and with not a dollar on hand to pay for the lines.

17. It contracts away a. the city's general powers and binds the city down with all the detail of a cutthroat building contract.

18. It reduces in some cases, instead of increasing, the transfer of passengers.

19. It takes away from the people the opportunity to acquire the street car lines—an opportunity that will not return.

These are some of the things in the ordinance, briefly stated, to which I object as a citizen who feels a deep interest in the concerns of my people. I see that this is the time for the people of Chicago to get municipal ownership of the street car lines, and I cannot remain silent in the face of this undertaking to prevent that accomplishment. The people can get municipal ownership now if they prevent the passage of this ordinance. They can prevent its passage by bringing the great weight of public opinion to bear against it. If they fail to do that, municipal ownership will have gone beyond their reach.

NEWS NOTES.

—The American Microscopical society closed its session at Buffalo on the 25th.

—The telegraph cable from Seattle, Wash., to Sitka, Alaska, laid under the act of Congress of 1903, and 970 miles in length, was completed on the 28th.

—Edmund J. James, president of the Northwestern University (Methodist) at Evanston, Ill., has accepted the presidency of the University of Illinois (a State institution) at Champaign.

—Murad V. of Turkey, who was dethroned in 1876 on allegations of insanity and thereupon succeeded by his brother, the present Sultan, Abul Hamid II, died in prison at Constantinople on the 30th at the age of 64.

—At the Democratic convention for the Territory of New Mexico, at Las Vegas on the 26th, Geo. P. Money was nominated for Territorial delegate to Congress by 117 votes over ex-Congressman Jerry Simpson, who received 36.

—The Rt. Hon. and Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, D. D., K. C. V. O., lord archbishop of Canterbury and primate of all England, arrived at New York on the 27th on the steamship Celtic, ac-